

Artin's Conjecture on Zeros of p -Adic Forms

D.R. Heath-Brown

February 19, 2010

Abstract

This is an exposition of work on Artin's Conjecture on the zeros of p -adic forms. A variety of lines of attack are described, going back to 1945. However there is particular emphasis on recent developments concerning quartic forms on the one hand, and systems of quadratic forms on the other.

Artin's Conjecture [1, Preface] is the following statement.

Conjecture *Let $F(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Q}_p[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a form of degree d . Then if $n > d^2$ the equation $F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ has a non-trivial solution in $\mathbb{Q}_p^n$.*

Here $\mathbb{Q}_p$ is the p -adic field corresponding to a rational prime p . Artin was led to his conjecture by considerations about C^i -fields, and the above assertion can be re-phased to say that $\mathbb{Q}_p$ is a C^2 -field. There are easy examples for every prime p and every degree d to show that one cannot take $n = d^2$ here. The conjecture can be generalized to more general $\mathfrak{p}$ -adic fields, and to systems of forms of degrees $d_1, \dots, d_r$, in which case the condition on n becomes $n > d_1^2 + \dots + d_r^2$.

One reason for the interest in Artin's Conjecture comes from the study of Local-to-Global Principles. One example is provided by the following theorem of Birch [4].

Theorem 1 *Let $F(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a non-singular form of degree $d \geq 2$ with $n > (d-1)2^d$. Then*

$$\#\{\underline{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : F(\underline{x}) = 0, \max_{i=1, \dots, n} |x_i| \leq B\} = c_F B^{n-d} + o(B^{n-d}) \quad (1)$$

as $B \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover the constant c_F is strictly positive providing that the equation $F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ has zeros in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and in each p -adic field.

Thus if Artin's Conjecture were true the p -adic condition would hold automatically, since $(d-1)2^d \geq d^2$.

Unfortunately Artin's Conjecture is currently only known in the cases $d = 1$ and 2 (which are classical), and $d = 3$ (due to Lewis [19]). Indeed the conjecture is known to be false in general, the first counterexample having been found by Terjanian [23], for degree $d = 4$. If one sets

$$G(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_1^4 + x_2^4 + x_3^4 - (x_1^2 x_2^2 + x_1^2 x_3^2 + x_2^2 x_3^2) - x_1 x_2 x_3 (x_1 + x_2 + x_3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_1, \dots, x_{18}) = & G(x_1, x_2, x_3) + G(x_4, x_5, x_6) + G(x_7, x_8, x_9) \\ & + 4G(x_{10}, x_{11}, x_{12}) + 4G(x_{13}, x_{14}, x_{15}) + 4G(x_{16}, x_{17}, x_{18}), \end{aligned}$$

then $F(\underline{x})$ is a form in 18 variables with only the trivial zero over $\mathbb{Q}_2$. Subsequent work has produced counter-examples for many values of d , though d is even in every case known.

Question 1 *Can one find any counter-examples to Artin's Conjecture with odd degree?*

The most important general result in the positive direction is that of Ax and Kochen [2].

Theorem 2 *For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a $p_0(d)$ such that Artin's Conjecture holds whenever $p \geq p_0(d)$.*

The proof uses Mathematical Logic, and is based on the fact that the analogue of Artin's Conjecture is known for the fields $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$. A value for $p_0(d)$ was found by Brown [8]:-

$$2^{2^{2^{2^{2^{d^{11^{4d}}}}}}} ! \tag{2}$$

Here the “!” symbol is merely an exclamation mark, and not a factorial sign! Another result by Ax and Kochen [3] shows that the theory of p -adic fields is decidable. Thus for each fixed prime p and each fixed degree d there is, in principle, a procedure for deciding whether the statement

“Every form $F(x_1, \dots, x_{d^2+1}) \in \mathbb{Q}_p[x_1, \dots, x_{d^2+1}]$ has a nontrivial zero over $\mathbb{Q}_p$.”

is true or false. It follows that one can, in theory, test every prime up to Brown's bound (2), and hence decide whether or not Artin's Conjecture holds for a given degree d .

A second approach to Artin's Conjecture, developed by Lewis [19] for $d = 3$, Birch and Lewis [5] for $d = 5$, and Laxton and Lewis [14] for $d = 7$ and 11 , applies a p -adic "minimization" process to the form F to produce a suitable model over $\mathbb{Z}_p$. One then examines the reduction $\overline{F}[\mathbf{x}] \in \mathbb{F}_p[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. If this can be shown to have a non-singular zero, Hensel's Lemma will allow us to lift it to a non-trivial zero of F over $\mathbb{Z}_p$. However this "minimization" method has limited applicability. If d can be written as a sum of composite numbers it is possible that $\overline{F}$ factors as $G_1^{e_1} \dots G_k^{e_k}$ with $\deg G_i \geq 2$ and $e_i \geq 2$ for every i . In this case it is impossible for $\overline{F}$ to have a non-singular zero. The method is therefore doomed to fail for such degrees. In fact $d = 1, 2, 3, 5, 7$ and 11 are the only integers which cannot be written as a sum of composite numbers. However for these values the method works moderately well, and produces results of the type given by Ax and Kochen, but with much smaller values for $p_0(d)$. Thus Leep and Yeomans [18] showed that one may take $p_0(5) = 47$, and Wooley [24], that $p_0(7) = 887$ and $p_0(11) = 8059$ are admissible. These are susceptible to further improvement, and indeed calculations by Heath-Brown have shown that for $d = 5$ Artin's Conjecture holds for $p \geq 17$.

Question 2 *Does Artin's Conjecture hold for $d = 5$, for every prime?*

This is certainly decidable in principle, but whether it is realistic to expect a computational answer with current technology is unclear.

The minimization approach can also be used for systems of forms. It shows (Demyanov [11]) that $n > 8$ suffices for a pair of quadratic forms, for every p , and (Birch and Lewis [6], Schuur [21]) that $n > 12$ suffices for a system of 3 quadratic forms, providing that $p \geq 11$. A very recent application involving forms of differing degrees has been given by Zahid [26], who shows that a quadratic and a cubic form over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ have a common zero if $n > 13 = 2^2 + 3^2$, providing that $p > 293$.

Since Artin's Conjecture is false in general, it is natural to ask about the number $v_d(p)$, defined as the minimal integer such that every form $F(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Q}_p[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ of degree d in $n > v_d(p)$ variables, has a non-trivial p -adic zero. We also write $v_d = \max_p v_d(p)$. Brauer [7] proved a result that implies that v_d is finite for every d .

Theorem 3 *For every degree d there is an integer v_d such that for each prime p , every form $F(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Q}_p[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ of degree d with $n > v_d$ has a non-trivial p -adic zero.*

Brauer's proof involves multiple nested inductions, and did not lead to explicit bounds for v_d . More recent versions of the argument due to Leep and Schmidt [17], and particularly Wooley [25], are vastly more efficient, yielding

$$v_d \leq d^{2^d} \quad (3)$$

in general, but this is still disappointingly large. Brauer's basic idea is to show that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the form F will represent a diagonal form in m variables as soon as n is large enough compared to m . It is not hard to show (Davenport and Lewis [10]) that for every p and every d one can solve diagonal equations

$$c_1 x_1^d + \dots + c_m x_m^d = 0$$

over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ as soon as $m > d^2$. Thus it suffices that F should represent a diagonal form in $m \geq d^2 + 1$ variables. We therefore seek linearly independent vectors $\underline{e}_1, \dots, \underline{e}_m \in \mathbb{Q}_p^n$ such that $F(\lambda_1 \underline{e}_1 + \dots + \lambda_m \underline{e}_m)$ is a diagonal form in $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$. If we choose the vectors $\underline{e}_i$ inductively it is clear that $\underline{e}_m$ must be a zero of a collection of forms of degree strictly less than d . Specifically there will be $m - 1$ forms of degree $d - 1$; $m(m - 1)/2$ forms of degree $d - 2$; and so on. The induction argument therefore involves the analogue of v_d for systems of forms of differing degrees, and not just for a single form of degree d .

There is an approach to these problems (Heath-Brown [12]) which is intermediate between the method of Lewis, Birch and Lewis, and Laxton and Lewis and that of Brauer, Schmidt and Wooley. In this intermediate approach one does not diagonalize F fully, but removes enough of the coefficients to ensure that there is a multiple of F which has a non-singular zero over $\mathbb{F}_p$, so that Hensel's Lemma can be used. As an example we have the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *Let $p \neq 2, 5$ or 13 be prime and let*

$$H(x, y, z) = Ax^4 + Bxy^3 + Cy^4 + Dxy^3 + Eyz^3 + Fz^4 \in \mathbb{Q}_p[x, y, z].$$

Suppose further that A, C and F are p -adic units. Then H must represent zero non-trivially over $\mathbb{Q}_p$.

In order to produce such forms by the inductive construction above one has to solve a system containing quadratic and linear equations, but not cubics.

The power of this new method is well illustrated by the case $d = 4$, for which a direct application of (3) yields $v_4 \leq 4294967296$. In contrast the new method (Heath-Brown [12, Theorem 2 and Note Added in Proof]) establishes the following bounds.

Theorem 4 *We have*

- (i) $v_4(p) \leq 120$ for $p \geq 11$,
- (ii) $v_4(p) \leq 128$ for $p = 3$ and $p = 7$,
- (iii) $v_4(5) \leq 312$, and
- (iv) $v_4(2) \leq 4221$.

Thus $v_4 \leq 4221$

One sees that $p = 2$ is the worst case by far. It is fair to say that we have absolutely no idea what the correct value for v_4 is, and it seems natural in particular to ask the following question.

Question 3 *Are there any counter-examples to Artin's Conjecture for quadratic forms with $p \neq 2$?*

It is convenient at this point to introduce the following notation. For any field K , let $\beta(r; K)$ be the least integer m such that a system of r quadratic forms over K has a non-trivial common zero in K as soon as the number of variables exceeds m . The case $d = 2$ of Artin's Conjecture, which is known to be true, yields $\beta(1; \mathbb{Q}_p) = 4$, and in general the conjecture would imply that $\beta(r; \mathbb{Q}_p) = 4r$.

The results on $v_4(p)$ from Heath-Brown [12] arise from the estimates

$$v_4(p) \leq \begin{cases} 16 + \beta(8; \mathbb{Q}_p), & p \neq 2, 5, \\ 40 + \beta(12; \mathbb{Q}_p), & p = 5, \\ 537 + \beta(43; \mathbb{Q}_p), & p = 2. \end{cases}$$

together with suitable bounds for $\beta(r; \mathbb{Q}_p)$. It is therefore natural to turn our attention to the question of systems of quadratic forms. For general r it has been shown by Leep [15] that $\beta(r; \mathbb{Q}_p) \leq 2r^2 + 2r$ for all r and p .

There have been subsequent small improvements, but in all cases the bound is asymptotic to $2r^2$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Leep's argument is an elementary induction on r , somewhat in the spirit of the Brauer induction method.

A recent alternative attack (Heath-Brown [13]) starts from the work of Birch and Lewis [6], who used the minimization approach to handle systems of three quadratic forms. In general this leads to a set of forms over $\mathbb{F}_p$ for which one wants to find a non-singular common zero. This is done via a counting argument, so that one requires, amongst other information, an estimate for the overall number of common zeros. The following rather easy lemma suffices.

Lemma 2 *Suppose we have a system of quadratic forms*

$$Q^{(i)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}_p[x_1, \dots, x_n], \quad (1 \leq i \leq r)$$

with N common zeros over $\mathbb{F}_p$. Write N_R for the number of vectors $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{F}_p^r$ for which

$$\sum_{i=1}^r u_i Q^{(i)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \tag{4}$$

has rank R , and assume that such a linear combination vanishes only for $\underline{u} = \underline{0}$. Then

$$|N - q^{n-I}| \leq \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n/2} q^{n-I-t} N_{2t}.$$

For vectors $\underline{u}$ in the algebraic completion $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$ the condition that (4) should have rank at most R defines a projective algebraic variety. It is possible to derive a good upper bound for the dimension of this set, using the fact that the original p -adic system was minimized. This bound on the dimension leads in turn to a bound for N_R . This enables one to show that the system of quadratic forms over $\mathbb{F}_p$ has a non-singular zero when p is large enough. In particular one can show that $\beta(r; \mathbb{Q}_p) = 4r$ as soon as $p > (2r)^r$.

In contrast to the situation for the original formulation of Artin's Conjecture, we know of no counter-examples for systems of quadratic forms. It is therefore possible that $\beta(r; \mathbb{Q}_p) = 4r$ for every prime p .

Question 4 *Is it true that $\beta(r; \mathbb{Q}_p) = 4r$ for every prime p ?*

It is not even known what happens if we restrict the quadratic forms to be diagonal.

The Ax-Kochen result already implies the existence of a bound p_r such that $\beta(r; \mathbb{Q}_p) = 4r$ for $p > p_r$. However the two methods have a very important difference when we come to apply them to finite extensions $\mathbb{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ of $\mathbb{Q}_p$. Suppose the residue field $F_{\mathfrak{p}}$ of such an extension has cardinality $q = p^e$. Then the Ax-Kochen theorem yields the existence of a bound $p_{r,e}$ such that $\beta(r; \mathbb{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}) = 4r$ for $p > p_{r,e}$. Thus there is a condition on the characteristic of $F_{\mathfrak{p}}$. For example, the theorem leaves open the possibility that $\beta(r; \mathbb{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}) > 4r$ whenever $\mathbb{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_2$. In contrast, the new method extends to give the following result.

Theorem 5 *We have $\beta(r; \mathbb{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}) = 4r$ whenever $\#\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}} > (2r)^r$.*

Here there is a condition on the cardinality of $\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}$, rather than its characteristic.

This makes a crucial difference when we consider the u -invariant of function fields of the form $\mathbb{Q}_p(t_1, \dots, t_k)$, as has been shown by Leep [16]. The u -invariant of a field K is the smallest integer n such that any quadratic form over K in more than n variables must have a non-trivial zero over K . Thus $u(\mathbb{R}) = \infty$, $u(\mathbb{C}) = 1$ and $u(\mathbb{Q}_p) = 4$. It is easy to see that $u(K(x)) \geq 2u(K)$ in general, and hence that $u(\mathbb{Q}_p(t_1, \dots, t_k)) \geq 2^{2+k}$ for all $k \geq 0$. Prior to the appearance of the new results on $\beta(r; \mathbb{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}})$ just described, the only values of k for which it was known that $u(\mathbb{Q}_p(t_1, \dots, t_k))$ is finite were $k = 0$ and $k = 1$. When $k = 1$, Parimala and Suresh [20] have recently shown that the u -invariant is 8, if $p \neq 2$. Indeed Wooley, in work to appear, has shown how to adapt the circle method to handle quite general problems over $\mathbb{Q}_p(t)$, proving in particular that $u(\mathbb{Q}_p(t)) = 8$ for every prime p .

In order to handle the u -invariant for function fields $\mathbb{Q}_p(\underline{t}) = \mathbb{Q}_p(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ in k variables, Leep considers a quadratic form $Q(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ over $\mathbb{Q}_p(\underline{t})$, in which the coefficients of Q are polynomials in $t_1, \dots, t_k$ of total degree at most d , say. One now considers a finite extension $\mathbb{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ of $\mathbb{Q}_p$, whose significance will become apparent later, and considers both Q and the X_i as polynomials in $t_1, \dots, t_k$ over the new field $\mathbb{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}$. If we suppose that the X_i are polynomials of total degree at most D then the overall number of coefficients in $X_1, \dots, X_n$ is

$$N := n(D + k) \dots (D + 1)/k!.$$

One may regard these coefficients as variables $c_1, \dots, c_N \in \mathbb{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}$, which one uses to force $Q(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ to vanish identically. Since $Q(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ has

total degree at most $2D + d$ as a function of $t_1, \dots, t_k$ there are at most

$$R := (2D + d + k) \dots (2D + d + 1)/k!$$

coefficients which one must arrange to vanish. Each of these is a quadratic form in $c_1, \dots, c_N$. According to Theorem 5 the corresponding system of quadratic forms has a non-trivial zero $(c_1, \dots, c_N) \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ providing that $N > 4R$ and $q > (2R)^R$, where q is the cardinality of the residue field of $\mathbb{Q}_p$. However it is clear that $N/R \rightarrow 2^{-k}n$ as $D \rightarrow \infty$. Hence if $n = 1 + 2^{2+k}$ we can choose $D = D(k, d)$ so that $N > 4R$. It follows that $Q(X_1, \dots, X_n) = 0$ has a non-trivial solution $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{Q}_p(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ providing that $q > q_0(k, d)$.

One now calls on a result of Springer [22], which states that if Q is a quadratic form over a field F of characteristic different from 2, which has a non-trivial zero over some extension of F of odd degree, then Q has a non-trivial zero over F itself. Thus to complete the proof it suffices to choose $\mathbb{Q}_p$ to be an extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ of odd degree, and for which $q > q_0(k, d)$. One may then apply Springer's result with $F = \mathbb{Q}_p(\underline{t})$ to produce a non-trivial zero of Q over the original field $\mathbb{Q}_p(\underline{t})$. We therefore have the following result, due to Leep [16].

Theorem 6 *We have $u(\mathbb{Q}_p(t_1, \dots, t_k)) = 2^{2+k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all primes p .*

The elegant feature of this argument is the way in which the size constraint on q disappears. It is clear that the actual bound $(2R)^R$ is irrelevant.

One can utilise the case $k = 1$ of Theorem 6 to obtain new bounds for $\beta(r; \mathbb{Q}_p)$. For example one has $\beta(3; \mathbb{Q}_p) \leq 16$ and $\beta(4; \mathbb{Q}_p) \leq 24$ for every prime p . These estimates are themselves used in the proof of Theorem 4. It is curious that these results hold even for the case when the residue field is small, even though Theorem 5, from which they derive, requires the residue field to be large.

As a corollary of Theorem 6 one can give an analogous statement for pairs of quadratic forms.

Theorem 7 *Two quadratic forms over $\mathbb{Q}_p(t_1, \dots, t_k)$, in at least $1 + 2^{3+k}$ variables, have a non-trivial common zero.*

This follows from a result of Brumer [9], which shows that if F is a field of characteristic different from 2, then a pair of quadratic forms over F will have a common zero as soon as the number of variables exceeds $u(F(X))$.

As with Theorem 6, there are examples showing that one cannot reduce the number of variables. Of course both results remain true if we replace $\mathbb{Q}_p$ by a finite extension.

In conclusion we remark that it would be interesting to know what happens for systems of cubic forms over $\mathbb{Q}_p$. One might hope to show that r cubic forms in $n > 9r$ variables have a common zero when the cardinality q of the residue field is large enough in terms of r . However this is currently known only for $r = 1$, by the result of Lewis [19]. If the general statement were established one could deduce an analogue of Theorem 6 for cubic forms, with the number of variables required to exceed 3^{2+k} . Here Springer's theorem would be replaced by the observation that if F is a field of characteristic zero, then any cubic form with a zero over a quadratic extension of F also has a zero over F itself.

References

- [1] E. Artin, *The collected papers of Emil Artin*, (Addison–Wesley, Reading, MA, 1965).
- [2] J. Ax and S. Kochen, Diophantine problems over local fields. I, *Amer. J. Math.*, 87 (1965), 605–630.
- [3] J. Ax and S. Kochen, Diophantine problems over local fields. II, A complete set of axioms for p -adic number theory, *Amer. J. Math.*, 87 (1965), 631–648.
- [4] B.J. Birch, Forms in many variables, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Ser. A* 265 (1961/1962), 245–263
- [5] B.J. Birch and D.J. Lewis, p -adic forms, *J. Indian Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 23 (1959), 11–32.
- [6] B.J. Birch and D.J. Lewis, Systems of three quadratic forms, *Acta Arith.*, 10 (1964/1965), 423–442.
- [7] R. Brauer, A note on systems of homogeneous algebraic equations, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 51 (1945), 749–755.

- [8] S.S. Brown, Bounds on transfer principles for algebraically closed and complete discretely valued fields, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 15 (1978), no. 204, iv+92pp.
- [9] A. Brumer, Remarques sur les couples de formes quadratiques, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 286 (1978), no. 16, A67–A681.
- [10] H. Davenport and D.J. Lewis, Homogeneous additive equations, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Ser. A*, 274 (1963), 443–460.
- [11] V.B. Demyanov, Pairs of quadratic forms over a complete field with discrete norm with a finite field of residue classes, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Mat.*, 20 (1956), 307–324.
- [12] D.R. Heath-Brown, Zeros of p -adic forms, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*
- [13] D.R. Heath-Brown, Zeros of systems of $\mathfrak{p}$ -adic quadratic forms, *Composito Math.*,
- [14] R.R. Laxton and D.J. Lewis, D. J. Forms of degrees 7 and 11 over $\mathfrak{p}$ -adic fields, *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, Vol. VIII, 16–21, (Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1965).
- [15] D.B. Leep, Systems of quadratic forms, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 350 (1984), 109–116.
- [16] D.B. Leep, The u -invariant of p -adic function fields, *preprint*.
- [17] D.B. Leep and W.M. Schmidt, Systems of homogeneous equations, *Invent. Math.*, 71 (1983), 539–549.
- [18] D.B. Leep and C.C. Yeomans, Quintic forms over p -adic fields, *J. Number Theory*, 57 (1996), 231–241.
- [19] D.J. Lewis, Cubic homogeneous polynomials over p -adic number fields, *Ann. of Math.*, (2) 56 (1952), 473–478.
- [20] R. Parimala and V. Suresh, The u -invariant of the function fields of p -adic curves, <http://arxiv.org/pdf/0708.3128v1>.
- [21] S.E. Schuur, On systems of three quadratic forms, *Acta Arith.*, 36 (1980), 315–322.

- [22] T.A. Springer, Sur les formes quadratiques d'indice zéro, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 234 (1952), 1517–1519.
- [23] G. Terjanian, Un contre-exemple à une conjecture d'Artin, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 262 (1966), A612.
- [24] T.D. Wooley, Artin's conjecture for septic and unidecic forms *Acta Arith.* 133 (2008), 25–35.
- [25] T.D. Wooley, On the local solubility of Diophantine systems, *Compositio Math.*, 111 (1998), 149–165.
- [26] J. Zahid, Simultaneous zeros of a cubic and quadratic form, <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1001.1055>.

Mathematical Institute,
 24–29, St Giles',
 Oxford OX1 3LB,
 UK

`rhb@maths.ox.ac.uk`